

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 ROB LEAR,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 SEATTLE HOUSING AUTHORITY,
14 et al.,

15 Defendants.

CASE NO. C13-0347JLR

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
TO DISMISS

16 Before the court is Defendant the State of Washington's ("the State") motion to
17 dismiss plaintiff Rob Lear's complaint. (Mot. (Dkt. # 48).) Mr. Lear has sued the Seattle
18 Housing Authority, the City of Seattle, and numerous other defendants in addition to the
19 State. (See Am. Compl. (Dkt. # 46).) He alleges civil conspiracy, industrial espionage,
20 housing discrimination, and other causes of action, claiming that he was "snatched.
21 Kidnapped. Entrapped. Ensnared." (*Id.* at 12.) He alleges numerous instances of harm
22 directed at him by Defendants. (*Id.* at 12-27.)

1 The State moves to dismiss under the doctrine of sovereign immunity. The State
2 argues that it is immune from suit in federal court under the Eleventh Amendment and
3 that, accordingly, it should be dismissed from this action with prejudice.

4 The court agrees. Under the Eleventh Amendment and the doctrine of sovereign
5 immunity, states may not be sued in federal court unless they have consented or
6 sovereign immunity has been abrogated. *Alaska Cargo Transp, Inc. v. Alaska R.R.*
7 *Corp.*, 5 F.3d 378, 379 (9th Cir. 1993). The State has not consented to being sued in
8 federal court. *See, e.g., Marshall v. Labor & Indus., State of Washington*, 89 F. Supp. 2d
9 4, 12 (D.D.C. 2000) (“Nothing in Washington’s law expressly or otherwise consents to
10 suit in federal court.”); *Hennessey v. State of Wash., Dep’t of Soc. & Health Servs.*, 627
11 F. Supp. 137, 139 (E.D. Wash. 1985). Further, Mr. Lear does not make any argument
12 with respect to abrogation (*see Resp.*), nor does he assert any causes of action for which
13 there is a plausible basis for arguing abrogation (*see Am. Compl.*). Thus, the State may
14 not be sued. *Alaska Cargo Transp.*, 5 F.3d at 379.

15 In response to the State’s motion, Mr. Lear cites several cases that do not apply
16 here, including *DeShaney v. Winnebago Cnty. Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 489 U.S. 189 (1989)
17 and *Cnty. of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833 (1998). These are both cases naming
18 counties as defendants, not states. Thus, these cases do not provide a basis for Mr. Lear
19 to get around Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity.


20 //

21 //

22 //

1 For the foregoing reasons, the State's motion is GRANTED and the State is
2 DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as a defendant in this action.

3 Dated this 7th day of October, 2013.

4
5 
6

7 JAMES L. ROBART
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22